

**REMARKS**

As a matter of review, Claims 14, 16, and 17 were previously cancelled and new claims 21 - 32 were added. Please cancel Claim 2 without prejudice. Claims 1, 3 - 13, 15, and 18 - 32 remain in the instant application. Claims 1, 5, 10 and 32 are amended herewith. Support for the amendment to these Claims is found on page 17, line 26 of the instant application.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for the reasons of record stated at page 2 of the Office Action. Claim 2 is cancelled herewith without prejudice. Hence, the rejection of Claim 2 is now moot.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 3 - 8, 12, 13, 15, 18, 21, and 27 - 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,199,464 issued to Cambre (hereinafter "Cambre") for the reasons of record stated at page 3 of the Office Action. Claims 2, 10, 11, 19, 20, 22 - 26, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Cambre for the reasons of record stated at pages 4 - 6 of the Office Action. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cambre for the reasons of record stated at pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action. Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,494,264 issued to Wattiez et al. (hereinafter "Wattiez") for the reasons of record stated on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action.

Cambre relates to laundry substrate articles which contain mixtures of specific nonionic and cationic surfactants. The articles of Cambre are formulated to increase the rate at which the nonionic/cationic surfactant mixture is released into the washing solution. [See Cambre column 1, lines 1 - 13]. The nonionic/cationic surfactants remain dispersed

throughout the laundry solution during the washing process. [See Cambre column 9, lines 55 - 64].

Wattiez purports to relates to an accessory which can be used to wash simultaneously a mixture of articles some of which are liable to lose their color while others are liable to absorb the dyes in the wash. [See Wattiez column 2, lines 8 - 14].


With regard to Cambre, the rejections as far as they apply to Claim 2 are now moot as Claim 2 stands cancelled without prejudice. With regard to the rejection of Claims 1, 3 - 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19 - 26, and 27 - 31, over Cambre and Claim 32 over Wattiez, these claims have been amended to include that the dye absorbing compound is a substantially insoluble cross-linked polymeric amine. Neither Cambre nor Wattiez teach or suggest either expressly or impliedly *inter alia* a dye absorbing compound which is a substantially insoluble cross-linked polymeric amine.

Hence, it is believed that the rejection of Claims 1, 3 - 8, 12, 13, 15, 18, 21, and 27 - 29 as anticipated by Cambre, the rejection of Claims 10, 11, 19, 20, 22 - 26, 30 - 31 as anticipated by or in the alternative as obvious over Cambre, the rejection of Claim 32 as anticipated by Wattiez, and the rejection of Claim 9 as obvious over Cambre are now overcome. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

**SUMMARY**

It is believed that the above amendments and remarks represent a complete response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112, second paragraph, placing the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
FOR: RAJAN K. PANANDIKER ET AL.,

  
Julia A. Glazer  
Reg. No. 41,783  
Attorney for Applicants  
(513) 627-4132

Dated: January 26, 2005  
Customer Number: 27752